

## REMARKS

In the Office action mailed September 10, 2004 ("Office Action"), the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 12, and 16-18 and objected to claims 2, 4-11, and 13-15. This reply amends claims 1-4, 8, 12, 17 and 18 and adds claims 19-24. Therefore, claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration.

### I. Response to objection of claims 2 and 4-11

The Examiner asserts that claims 2 and 4-11 contain informalities. This reply amends claims 2, 4, and 8 to address the issue raised by the Examiner.

### II. Response to §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 17

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by WIPO Published Application No. 98/24271 ("Miyashita"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131.

Claim 1 is patentable over Miyashita because Miyashita does not disclose each and every element of the claim 1. Claim 1 includes grooves in an insulating film "extending over two or more pixel sites." Miyashita does not disclose this feature. Miyashita teaches forming a pixel in an area surrounded by walls 105. See Miyashita, Figure 1. These walls form box-shaped holes for each pixel. See Miyashita, Figure 8. As the walls separate each pixel from the other pixels, there are no grooves "extending over two or more pixel sites."

Claim 17 is patentable over Miyashita for at least the same reason claim 1 is patentable over Miyashita.

### III. Response to §103(a) rejection of claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WIPO Published Application No. 98/24271 ("Miyashita") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,855,994 ("Biebuyck"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03.

Claim 3 comprises filling a groove extending over two or more pixel sites with a solution in which an organic EL material is dissolved. Neither Miyashita nor Biebuyck, when taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest this feature.

As previously explained, Miyashita does not teach or suggest a groove extending over two or more pixel sites. Instead, Miyashita teaches forming each pixel in a box-shaped hole. See Miyashita, Figure 8.

Biebuyck discloses methods of protecting organic light emitting devices ("OLED") from contamination and corrosion by encapsulating them in layers of Siloxanes and Siloxane derivatives. See Biebuyck, col. 2, ll. 38, 39, 48-52; col. 3, ll. 4-12. Additionally, Biebuyck teaches a method of making a multicolor display by embedding a "color converter" in the encapsulation layer. As explained in column 6, lines 5-11 and 37-57, a Silocane film covering an OLED panel has a set of pathways. The pathways contain "color conversion dyes." The dyes filter white light from the OLED panel to create a multicolor display.

As Biebuyck is directed to methods of encapsulating and protecting OLEDs, Biebuyck does not teach methods of making organic EL devices. Therefore, Biebuyck does not teach or suggest a solution in which an organic EL material is dissolved or filling a groove with such a solution.

As Miyashita and Biebuyck, when taken as a whole, do not teach or suggest all the features of claim 3, claim 3 is patentable over Miyashita in view of Biebuyck.

#### **IV. Response to §103(a) rejection of claim 18**

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WIPO Published Application No. 98/24271 ("Miyashita") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,270,823 ("Kuznetzoff"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03.

Claim 18 recites the features "forming grooves extending over two or more pixel sites" and filling grooves "by capillary phenomenon." Miyashita and Kuznetzoff when taken as a whole do not teach or suggest these features.

As previously explained, Miyashita does not teach or suggest a groove extending over two or more pixel sites or filling by capillary phenomenon. Instead, Miyashita teaches forming each pixel in a box-shaped hole. See Miyashita, Figure 8.

Kuznetzoff discloses a method of forming electrodes in slots by filling the slot with a high viscosity carrier medium such as a paste. See Kuznetzoff, col. 1, ll. 65-68. Nowhere does Kuznetzoff disclose filling by capillary phenomenon or extending grooves over two or more pixel sites.

Neither Miyashita nor Kuznetzoff, taken individually or in combination teach or suggest

"forming grooves extending over two or more pixel sites" or filling "by capillary phenomenon." Therefore, claim 18 is patentable over Miyashita in view of Kuznetzoff.

#### **V. Response to 102(e) rejection of claims 12 and 16**

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,614,174 ("Urabe"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131.

Claim 12 is patentable over Urabe because Urabe does not disclose each and every element of claim 12. Claim 12 includes an insulating film in which grooves are extended over two or more pixel sites. Urabe does not disclose this feature. Although Urabe discloses an organic electro-luminescent element in Figures 1, 7, and 8, nowhere does Urabe disclose an insulating film in which grooves are extended over two or more pixel sites. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over Urabe.

Claim 16 is patentable over Urabe for at least the same reason claim 12 is patentable over Urabe.

#### **VI. Response to objection of claims 13-15**

The Examiner objected to claims 13-15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection. As previously explained, base claim 12 is patentable over the prior art. Therefore, claims 13-15 do not depend upon a rejected base claim.

#### **VII. New claims 19-24**

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 22 is allowable at least because it contains the features of claim 13, its base claim, and all intervening claims.

Claims 19-21, 23 and 24 are allowable at least because they depend upon allowable claims.

#### **VIII. Conclusion**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all

pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan 10 2005

By: M. Henry  
Mark J. Henry  
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501